Case 1:05-cv-00457-LJO-DLB Document 14 Filed 02/23/06 Page 1 of 3 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 11 ROBERT GLASS. CV F- 05-0457 REC DLB P 12 Plaintiff, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 13 RECOMMENDING THAT v. PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR A.K. SCRIBNER, et. al., 14 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF BE DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE 15 Defendant. [DOC #3] 16 17 18 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with a civil rights 19 complaint filed on April 8, 2005. At the time he filed his complaint, plaintiff also filed a motion for 20 temporary restraining order in which he requests a court order directing prison officials to allow his 21 religious organization to provide plaintiff with his religious dietary needs. 22 "[A] preliminary injunction is an extraordinary and drastic remedy, one that should not be 23 granted unless the movant, by a clear showing, carries the burden of persuasion." Mazurek v. 24 Armstrong, 520 U.S. 968, 972 (1997) (quotations and citations omitted). The purpose of a 25 preliminary injunction is to preserve the status quo if the balance of equities so heavily favors the moving party that justice requires the court to intervene to secure the positions until the merits of the 26 action are ultimately determined. University of Texas v. Camenisch, 451 U.S. 390, 395 (1981). A 27 28 preliminary injunction is available to a plaintiff who "demonstrates either (1) a combination of

Case 1:05-cv-00457-LJO-DLB Document 14 Filed 02/23/06 Page 2 of 3

4 6 7

8 9 10

12 13

11

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

25

24

26 27

28

probable success and the possibility of irreparable harm, or (2) that serious questions are raised and the balance of hardship tips in its favor." Arcamuzi v. Continental Air Lines, Inc., 819 F. 2d 935, 937 (9th Cir. 1987). Under either approach the plaintiff "must demonstrate a significant threat of irreparable injury." Id. Also, an injunction should not issue if the plaintiff "shows no chance of success on the merits." Id. At a bare minimum, the plaintiff "must demonstrate a fair chance of success of the merits, or questions serious enough to require litigation." Id.

A federal court is a court of limited jurisdiction. Because of this limited jurisdiction, as a threshold and preliminary matter the court must have before it for consideration a "case" or "controversy." Flast v. Cohen, 392 U.S. 83, 88 (1968). If the court does not have a "case" or "controversy" before it, it has no power to hear the matter in question. Rivera v. Freeman, 469 F. 2d 1159, 1162-63 (9th Cir. 1972).

"A federal court may issue an injunction if it has personal jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter jurisdiction over the claim; it may not attempt to determine the rights of persons not before the court." Zepeda v. United States Immigration Service, 753 F.2d 719, 727 (9th Cir. 1985) (emphasis added). The Court has only recently ordered service of the complaint on defendants. Service has not yet ben accomplished. Therefore, at this juncture, plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief is premature. Plaintiff may file another motion for preliminary injunctive relief at a later stage. Plaintiff is cautioned to any further motions for preliminary injunctive relief that are filed before defendants are served with process in this case will be denied as premature.

Based on the foregoing, the court HEREBY RECOMMENDS that plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief, filed April 8, 2005, be DENIED, without prejudice.

These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fifteen (15) days after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d

Case 1:05-cv-00457-LJO-DLB Document 14 Filed 02/23/06 Page 3 of 3 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/ Dennis L. Beck UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE **Dated:** February 22, 2006 3c0hj8